

Oct. 22, Sunday, 94  
Wellfleet

- I suspect there are many in this group who have reservations about what you have heard said ~~was~~ about Hiroshima or the Enola Gay exhibit or about proposed plans to educate the public - but have held back expressing them (because you think you would be misunderstood, or offensive, or not P.C.)

I suspect this would be true of any American who have not read the facts in the essays of Alperin or Bird (or Mitchell or Schuman). I invite these questions to be raised.

- Cameron, too, with Ruth Rosen, Slotkin, Kipton, Kai, Eric Markum  
Katy Bateson Birnbaum

- to Reich: How do you understand events in Rwanda, Bosnia? (Tokyo, Nanjing, ~~How Dresden?~~ ~~What~~ How relate to Auschwitz?)

Dyson: We tried to create a preston every trial - succeeded only in Nuremberg + Dresden - summit, Cologne, Berlin.

If the Allies could have killed 6 M <sup>or esp. Japanese</sup> Germans, <sup>civilians</sup> they would have done so - before the know of the Final Solution. (Instead of only killing 1 M Germans + Japanese civs).

What has Reich/Kipton heard about the importance of historical memory, or responsibility?

(- Mail copy to MBB of minutes

Hitler's access to Europe, or the ground, was more efficient + effective ~~than~~ Allied bombing - the intention WAS NOT DIFFERENT.



22 Oct 94

~~On~~

Hard issues:

to Kipton  
group

(2-12!)

1. What if it had been Barbo or fusionion?

SV entry, + accession  
of Emperor and his  
trial, + not kept  
secret.  
by Sept.

- prospect of 500K-1M casualties?

- prospect of 12,000-46,000 deaths (less than Nag.)

2. It was not Barbo(-in-August) or fusionion. ~~He~~ He knows he didn't have to Barbo-in-August or fusionion.

(2) - The Japanese would probably have surrendered  
on some terms in August or September even if nothing had  
without Barbo

done differently earlier.

- SV entry

If right would prob.  
have done this by Sept-Oct  
even without SV entry or Barbo  
[USBS - "cutting off Dec."]

- Japanese approach US directly, ask for  
"minor" (to US) concession  
- which we would accept.

Probably no "line" was saved by barbo in  
August - over the war started by a day or a week.

They were ready to surrender - only issue was terms (w.d.): Emperor....  
(b) If these things had been announced earlier - e.g. by May - US line lost in Okinawa could  
have been saved

Still, Japanese might have prevailed - e.g. by successful  
comp - and held out for terms that would have  
protected them from war crimes trials!

- Should Barbo have been used to reject  
the Am's demands? Or the demands granted,  
to avert Barbo or fusionion?

[Or - was Mecklenburg + Adm. right - reject Emperor, to him?]



(What of using A-bomb on Kyoto, or Tokyo?)

74

3. What if choice was: Bomb Tokyo + 18 cities, or Sweden?

That ~~the~~ might have been valid — at least, closer —

though it might not have been: Navy didn't think so [Pres. a Navy man], prob. right; even AAF feared war would end with an AF "success" (M+L).

What would Trump have said?

- I would say:

- Don't terrify — certainly, on that scale.

- Wrong; illegal; (Post War, contrary to Mendelsohn)

- and fatal precedent, give MP, nuclear war, TV weapons;

- only US/UK could do that in '45;

- we would now be threatened by non-nuc bombing; but even we,

and now everyone, face <sup>potential</sup> here threat

for East time for us, from actual negotiations or admissions, till breakup of FSU, spread of technology & fin. war (that's to Atom for Russia, one way).

4. To save Americans, Bomb could — or Tokyo — would have been justified to save 1 US life — or, 1000.

For others — us, all of us? — it would not have been justified to save 46,000 US lives. or Russia or 1 million?



5. Now about: — to improve US bargaining position with SU?  
— to keep SU out of Japan, (Menschin?) (?)  
— to justify cost of MP?  
— for revenge? (NOT NEEDED! Fair bargaining!)

Could we?  
Lesson learnt —  
or we would have  
acted soon then ago

6. — Recognize plausibility of official story.

("Like — earth is flat, sun goes around earth...")

Consider this with: <sup>2)</sup> extreme self-interest, self-defence, just.

b) Unchallenged official story, lie, serving, for 20  
years; (till 1965)

c) Unchallenged media presentation for 49 years!

Challenging this was crazily anti-American prejudice, "ignorant"!

"extreme" pro. or anti-American values

or post War

like challenging (in SU, in CP time business) that Bolsheviks  
had "caused" the Russian Revolution (with the "demands": Land +  
Peace)

(or, less: that N had bought out a peace  
agreement by Dwight D. Eisenhower, instead of  
of concessions (military withdrawal, Committee of  
Reconciliation/political terms (the concession: withdraw I think,  
except I think is from till elections)

(N was using Shimshin Play — including using bombing  
to intimidate Communists in "postwar" relations, and to  
cover US concessions. ("Shooting an arrow out of the saloon" —  
the cover story for Cambodia, Laos, etc. — pretending to do what  
he did do is Dwight — except that he went to shoot his  
arrow back in to saloon, after troops were withdrawn!)



Oct 22,  
Willebrand

- What is to be learned from

- "Crisis" (?) of Hiroshima

- AND COVER-UP?

→ Japanese life was cheap to US leaders (and public!)  
but, as cheap - if public voluntary attack was deliberate?  
10 bombs? - like China lies to Japanese!

of March 1945, and certainly of August.

(Not: "US lies were extremely valuable" (compared to  
a "small number" of Japanese civilians: \$20,000 + 45,000  
(really, 200,000 + 100,000)  
compared to "500K-1M US")

[See Palestine, (Okinawa?)

→ To spread <sup>to, and</sup> leaves - as Japanese, USSR, UK, US - don't give  
with S.B. cap. or A/H-leaves. SAFER TO BAN THAN TO ALLOW  
SPREAD.

- or let the decide, in secret, for us  
or lie & keep secrets.

[Hypo: <sup>(a)</sup> KEEPING MIN DET FORCES WILL LEAD TO SPREAD  
AND USE. (under current conditions)

(What if: <sup>(b)</sup> attempting to ban?

Depends on conditions that affect  
effectiveness of ban.

(c) Current approach - seems to be spread & use.